



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,309	11/06/2000	Devendra Kalra	51309	9427

23838 7590 07/19/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,309

Applicant(s)

KALRA, DEVENDRA

Examiner

Thomas E. Shortledge

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 05/11/2006.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 18 and 28 are independent.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05/11/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants (pertaining to claims 1, 9, 18 and 28) argue that Rowe et al. do not disclose initializing a computing device with a portion of a font data for a particular language, the portion including less than all of the font data for the particular language and that Rowe et al. do not disclose the concept of utilizing a portion but less than all of the font data for a particular language. Further, the applicants argue Rowe et al. has no disclosure of portions of font data, initializing with a portion of font data including less than all of the font data of a particular language, or loading the further portion of the font data as claimed (Remarks, page 8). However, the examiner argues that Rowe et al. (6,073,148) teach initializing available font data that allows the software to properly display a particular language or font reference. The available font data includes substitute font data, which is loaded when a particular needed font data is not available. The substitute font data only contains portions of the font data that is needed to properly

Art Unit: 2626

display a particular language. The substitute font data allows the software to display portions of the specific needed font data, and the substitute font information is updated to properly display the specific language or font reference with the needed font data as it becomes available. The substitute font is able to display only a portion of the needed font data for a specific language or font reference, and is only able to properly display the entire font, when the need font data portions are downloaded (col. 28, lines 5-20 and 47-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 17-22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe et al. (6,073,148).

As to claims 1 and 9, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a portable device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

initializing the computing device with a portion of font data for a particular language, the portion including less than all of the font data for the particular language (initializing a computing device with shared font data found on the device, fonts needed to display the document that are found on the device are used it is further taught that the font data can be substitute font data, and the font data only contains a portion of the proper font data to be displayed, col. 28 lines 7-13);

receiving input text in the computing device to initiate the document creation process (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether the portion of the font data is sufficient to create the document on the computing device (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, col. 28, lines 8-10);

loading a further portion of the font data to the computing device from a data storage location if the computing device cannot create the document with portion of the font data (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded to properly display the characters that can't be displayed by the substitute font data, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, col. 28, lines 55-60), wherein the further portion of the font data alone or in combination with the portion of the font data are used to create the document (the stored font data and downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claims 18, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a computing device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

receiving input text in the computing device (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether the computing device has a portion of font data for a particular language stored therein to create the document, the portion less than all of the font data for the particular language and if so, creating the document (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, where the font stored on the computing device is not able to fully and correctly create the document based on the stored font, further taught that the font data can be substitute font data, and the font data only contains a portion of the proper font data to be displayed, col. 28, lines 8-13);

downloading a further portion of the font data from a data storage location when the computing device does not have the font data stored therein to create the document (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, the font data being the substitute font data, col. 28, lines 55-60),

creating the document using at least the further portion of the font data, wherein the document allows for the display of the input text (the stored font data and

Art Unit: 2626

downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claim 28, Rowe et al. teach:

creating a document on a computing device (creating a document on a portable device, col. 27, lines 58-67);

receiving input text in the computing device to initiate the document creation process (downloading an electronic document, col. 27, lines 66-67);

based on the input text, determining whether a portion of font data for a particular language, to create the document on the computing device is loaded, wherein displaying the document includes displaying the input text (determining if the font stored is able to properly display the document, where the font stored on the computing device is not able to fully and correctly create the document based on the stored font, further taught that the font data can be substitute font data, and the font data only contains a portion of the proper font data to be displayed, col. 28, lines 8-13);

loading a further portion of the font data to the computing device from a data storage location if the computing device cannot create the document with the portion of the font data (if desired font data is not found with the device data store, the font is downloaded to properly display the characters that can't be displayed by the substitute font data, and the effected portions of the text are redrawn with that font data, col. 28, lines 55-60), wherein the further portion of the font data alone or in combination with the portion of the font data are used to create the document, wherein the document allows

Art Unit: 2626

for the display of the input text (the stored font data and downloaded font data are used to display the document on the device, col. 28, lines 5-10 and 55-60).

As to claims 2 and 21, Rowe et al teach further discarding undesired data from the computing device after creating the document (font data is stored within downloaded electronic documents, the downloaded font data not being stored within a non-volatile memory, allowing the font data to be discarded once the downloaded electronic data is viewed and discarded, col. 27, line 58 through col. 28, line 11, and col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claims 3 and 22, Rowe et al. teach further comprising dynamically loading the further portion of the font data during the text inputting step (loading a further portion of font data within a downloaded document, col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claim 10, Rowe et al. teach displaying the document on a monitor (view an electronic document on a computer device, col. 27, lines 60-67).

As to claim 11, Rowe et al teach further discarding undesired data from the computing device after creating the document (font data is stored within downloaded electronic documents, the downloaded font data not being stored within a non-volatile memory, allowing the font data to be discarded once the downloaded electronic data is viewed and discarded, col. 27, line 58 through col. 28, line 11, and col. 28, lines 55-67).

As to claim 12, Rowe et al. teach the means for inputting the text comprises one of a keyboard, mouse, pointing device and voice (a computer with a keyboard, col. 5, lines 30-32).

As to claim 17, Rowe et al. teach the computing device comprises one of a personal computer, laptop computer, personal digital assistant, cellular telephone, and a net appliance (a digital computer, col. 5, lines 30-31).

As to claim 19, Rowe et al. teach the downloading the further portion of the font data is performed in a sequential manner (the font data is downloaded after the computer determines if the stored is able to display the document, col. 28, lines 5-12 and 55-60).

As to claim 20, Rowe et al. teach downloading the further portion of the font data is performed in a periodical manner (data is downloaded periodically to the computing device, col. 28, lines 1-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2626

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-8, 13-16, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. as applied to claims 1, 9, and 18 above, and further in view of Lakritz (6,623,529).

As to claims 4 and 23, Rowe et al. do not teach inputting text in a first language and loading the further portion of the font data that corresponds to a second language.

However, Lakritz teaches a process of localizing documents or web sites by adjusting their language content of the web site or document, (col. 3, lines 27-31). Where it would be necessary that the process of localizing the language content of a document would include a document in a first language and data that translates the document to the second language, where the data would include font data to present the document to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 5, Rowe et al. teach displaying the document on a monitor (view an electronic document on a computer device, col. 27, lines 60-67).

As to claims 6, 14 and 25, Rowe et al. do not teach the first language comprises a Roman language and the second language comprises a non-Roman language.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claims 7, 15 and 26, Rowe et al. do not teach the first language comprises a non-Roman language and the second language comprises a Roman language.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20), where it would be necessary that a translation can go from English to Japanese, a translation from Japanese to English would also be possible.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claims 8, 16 and 27, Rowe et al. teach the first language comprises English and the second language comprises non-English.

However, Lakritz teaches translating the word string from English to Japanese, (col. 8, lines 12-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 13, Rowe et al. do not teach the text is inputted in a first language and the document is created in a second language different from the first.

However, Lakritz teaches a process of localizing documents or web sites by adjusting their language content of the web site or document, (col. 3, lines 27-31). Where it would be necessary that the process of localizing the language content of a document would include a document in a first language and data that translates the document to the second language, where the data would include font data to present the document to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory

requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

As to claim 24, Rowe et al. do not teach displaying the document on the monitor in the second language.

However, Lakritz teach a document localization management and delivery system for computer applications, for viewing localizations of web pages, (col. 3, lines 25-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Rowe et al. with the methods of Lakritz to create a system to localize documents while reducing the overall memory requirements and enhancing the maintainability of the system as a whole, as taught by Lakritz (col. 2, lines 11-14).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 09/707,309
Art Unit: 2626

Page 14

TS
07/12/06



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER